



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,403	02/13/2006	Stanley R. Pearson	16515.4001	7638
34313	7590	10/15/2009	EXAMINER	
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP			VALENROD, YEVGENY	
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4 PARK PLAZA			1621	
SUITE 1600				
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/568,403	PEARSON, STANLEY R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YEVEGENY VALENROD	1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 45-48 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 45-48 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/10/08, 1/16/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group III, claims 45-48, in the reply filed on 7/6/09 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In line 3 of claim 45, applicants recite the following limitation:

“... feedstock is introduced into time an elevated temperature...”

The above limitation is deemed indefinite.

Claims 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The last three lines of claim 45 are indefinite. The limitation in question is directed to adjusting the exit gas temperature to produce the desired syngas composition depending in the intended use of the syngas. This limitation renders the claim indefinite because the meets and bounds of the claim are unclear. The language leaves open the possibility of an individual practicing the method

of claim 45, producing the syngas, and then using for in a manner that was not originally intended, thus practicing an invention in a manner that falls outside of the scope of claim 45.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 46 the temperature range for the syngas leaving the reformer is 8710 C to about 12040 C. In claim 47 the same range is 8980 C to about 9620 C. Although Examiner believes the temperature ranges are a typo and applicant meant for the last "0" in the above numbers to represent the degree sign "⁰", the range as instantly claimed has not been disclosed in the specification. For the purposes of examination, the temperature range will be interpreted as 871⁰ C to about 1204⁰ C for claim 46 and 898⁰ C to about 962⁰ C for claims 47-48. These ranges are supported on page 7 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thiebaut et al (US 6,274,096).

Scope of prior art

Thiebaut teaches preparation of syngas in a reformer where the exit temperature is 880^0 C (which examiner interprets as about 898^0 C) and the feed is introduced at 515^0 C, which examiner is interpreting as elevated temperature.

Ascertaining the difference between prior art and instant claims

Thiebaut is silent as to the contact time of the organic feed in the reformer.

Thiebaut teaches preheating the feed to a temperature of 515^0 C, while instant claims 46 – 48 require the preheating temperature to be 204^0 C.

Obviousness

While Thiebaut is silent with regards to the contact time of the organic feed in the reformer, it is inherent that in the process of Thienaut that a contact time of the organic feed in the reformer is present. Inherency is based on the fact that organic feed enters and exits the reformer thus spending time in the reformer. The contact time in the reformer is treated as here as the duration of the reaction that occurs in the reformer. One skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the duration of the reaction as part

of the routine experimentation with the goal of optimization, be it product quality, yield or byproduct content. Absent unexpected results demonstrated as comparative examples, the limitations directed to contact time are deemed obvious.

Varying the temperature of the preheated feed is obvious. One skilled in the art would find it obvious to vary parameters such as temperature as part of routine experimentation. There is motivation to preheat the feed to a lower temperature than what Thiebaut teaches. First one would prefer lower temperature because it reduces the energy requirements of the process. Second one would alter the temperature of the feed depending on the nature of the feed in order to find optimal conditions for the process. A showing of unexpected results resulting from the temperature of the preheated feed would be sufficient to overcome this rejection.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 45-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-24 of U.S. Patent No. 7,375,142. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

The steps recited in the instant claims 45-48 are limitations of claims 22-24 of the '142 patent.

Conclusion

Claims 45-48 are pending

Claims 45-48 are rejected

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yevgeny Valenrod whose telephone number is 571-272-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yevgeny Valenrod/

Yevgeny Valenrod
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

/Jafar Parsa/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621